

make quite a ~~request~~. Then after ^{they} finished he said, You don't need to ~~worry~~ worry. It won't be done the way I would like to see it done," Well, I thought if it's alright to applaud one statement of a Professor, why would it be wrong to applaud another statement? I felt I had to give a witness to my disagreement to his statement at that point so I all alone in the room applauded that statement! My applause did not go on very long, but very soon the German students scraped their feet on the floor as a sign of disapproval.

But I feel that God has given us the Scripture as the guide for our lives and that any version of Scripture -- Dr. Wilson used to say, Any version honestly made will show the way of salvation. I think I could go further than that. I could say that any version of Scripture gives enough truth no matter who makes it, that people can find in it the way of salvation if they really want to find it. The RSV is in many ways a very excellent translation. It does translate many things very very excellently in beautiful English just so long as there is no Messianic implications. But once you find that, in the OT there seems always as in the cases that I've given you to be a translation that has no warrant. I could easily point you to several cases like the two I've pointed to already, where there is absolutely no warrant for the translation of what they have given.

I was much interested to find that when the RSV-NT came out, there was hardly any note on the first page of it. But when the complete Bible came out, on the first page of the NT which was not quite as prominent as if it had been just the NT, there was a footnote which is in this copy I have here, after it deals with the statement that Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary of whom Jesus was born who is called Christ, -- it has a footnote: other ancient authorities read: Joseph to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary was the father of Jesus who is called Christ.

That seemed to be absolutely ridiculous to translate a verse in such a way that it denies the whole detailed account of the virgin birth which precedes it. So I thought, Just how many ~~of these~~ are these "ancient authorities" that insert the statement here which denies the virgin birth? I was interested to find that there were some -- evidently some copyists of the Greek NT in the early days who were not quite satisfied with the words: "the husband of Mary of whom Jesus was born who is called Christ." ~~Thus~~ Does that bring out the virgin birth strongly enough?

I don't know whether they purposely changed it, but at least they did change it so that we have a few Greek versions which say, "Joseph to whom was betrothed ~~the~~ (you notice not married) the virgin (and they insert the word virgin) Mary, of whom was born Christ, or who was the mother of Christ. There are a few Greek versions which have that, but there is no Greek text which has the quotation they have here. But there is a Syriac translation of the Greek, of which we have 2 or 3 MSS, and one of those MSS